REMARKS

1. Present Status of Patent Application

This is a full and timely response to the outstanding Non-Final Office Action mailed March 15, 2011. In the present response, claims 1, 9, 14, 17, 18, and 30 have been amended. No new matter has been added with these amendments. Reconsideration and allowance of the application and presently pending claims 1-9 and 14-34 are respectfully requested.

2. Examiner Interview

The Examiner is encouraged to contact Assignee's attorney, after reviewing the present response, to resolve or discuss any questions or outstanding issues in an effort to expedite examination of the present application.

3. Response to Rejection of Claims under 35 U.S.C. §102

Claims 17 and 30-33 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as allegedly being anticipated by *Mooney* (U.S. Patent Publication No. 2002/0174194). The rejection is traversed for at least the following reasons.

a. Claim 17

Independent claim 17 recites:

> A system for integrating communication services, comprising:
>
> a computer processor; and
>
> a tray manager associating a plurality of communication accounts with a first identifier, the plurality of communication accounts comprising a first communication account for a first communication service and a second communication account for a second communication service;
>
> the tray manager associating an options configuration with the first identifier, wherein the options configuration includes at least one configurable setting option related to the first communication service;
>
> ***the tray manager detecting that a desktop component associated with the second communication account for the second communication service associated with the first identifier is being actively utilized, wherein the desktop component that is associated***

> ***with the second communication account is detected to be active when the desktop component is instantiated and in focus; and***
>
> ***the tray manager implementing, upon detection of the desktop component being actively utilized, the options configuration associated with the first identifier including the at least one configurable setting option related to the first communication service***.

(Emphasis added).

Independent claim 17 is allowable for at least the reason that *Mooney* fails to teach or suggest at least "the tray manager detecting that a desktop component associated with the second communication account for the second communication service associated with the first identifier is being actively utilized, wherein the desktop component that is associated with the second communication account is detected to be active when the desktop component is instantiated and in focus; and the tray manager implementing, upon detection of the desktop component being actively utilized, the options configuration associated with the first identifier including the at least one configurable setting option related to the first communication service," as emphasized above.

For example, *Mooney* describes:

> For example, the message accounts can comprise a Microsoft Exchange email account provided on a Microsoft Exchange messaging server, a Lotus Notes email account provided on a Domino server and a Groupwise email account provided on a Groupwise server. These email accounts are arranged to be accessed using client application software specific to each type of email account and previously users have needed to install that application software on a user terminal. However, the present invention avoids this requirement by using a web server that provides a single web interface via which all the email accounts are accessible.
>
> The web server receives user inputs from a web browser on the user's terminal. These user inputs indicate for example that the user wishes to access email messages from one of the email accounts. The web server has access to pre-specified information about the messaging servers and about user names and passwords for the various email accounts. Also, the web server is able to communicate with all the

> different types of messaging server, for example, to retrieve email messages. Information from the messaging servers can then be displayed by the web server, using the single web interface. Thus by using a single web-interface the user is able to access all his or her message accounts and does not need to store application software for each account type on his or her terminal.
>
> The user only needs to learn how to use the single web-interface and does not need to continually adjust to different interfaces provided by the different message accounts.

Paragraphs 0012-0014. And, the Office Action construes web browser code in *Mooney* with the claimed service interface layer; construes a Cclient module with the claimed user agent; and construes web-based interface in *Mooney* with the claimed tray manager.

Mooney further describes:

> FIG. 7 shows an example of a user interface display presented to a user using the web based interface. The display contains a plurality of tabs 170 one for each message server that the user has pre-specified. By selecting a tab the user is automatically logged into the associated message server without an interactive dialog appearing. For example, in FIG. 7 the CallPilot tab has been selected and messages from the users CallPilot account are displayed. If the user selects the Exchange tab, then the user is automatically logged onto an Exchange server and messages from a pre-specified account on that server are displayed.
>
> . . .
>
> In the example shown in FIG. 7 the user is able to view and work with messages from only one particular message server at a time. However, this is not essential. It is also possible for messages from each of the message servers to be combined into a single "in-box" for access by the user.

Paragraphs 0105 and 0107. And, the Office Action construes a tab and the associated messaging account in *Mooney* as the claimed communication suite. *See* page 3. Claim 17 describes a scenario where a first communication account for a first communication service and a second communication account for a second communication service are associated with a first identifier. Further, claim 17 describes that a desktop component of the second communication service is detected to be actively utilized which causes option configuration(s) associated with the first communication account associated with the first communication service to be implemented.

Correspondingly, the Office Action references the CallPilot2 tab of Figure 7. However, use or selection of the CallPilot2 tab (e.g., one account) may cause a setting associated with the CallPilot2 tab or account to be implemented **but does not cause any settings associated with any of the tabs or accounts to take effect upon detection of another tab being in focus**.

As such, *Mooney* fails to teach or suggest at least "the tray manager detecting that a desktop component associated with the second communication account for the second communication service associated with the first identifier is being actively utilized, wherein the desktop component that is associated with the second communication account is detected to be active when the desktop component is instantiated and in focus; and the tray manager implementing, upon detection of the desktop component being actively utilized, the options configuration associated with the first identifier including the at least one configurable setting option related to the first communication service," as recited in claim 17.

As a result, claim 17 is patentable over *Mooney*, and the rejection of claim 17 should be withdrawn.

b. Claims 30-33

Independent claim 30 recites:

> A method for integrating communication services, comprising:
>
> associating a plurality of communication accounts with a first identifier, the plurality of communication accounts comprising a first communication account for a first communication service and a second communication account for a second communication service;
>
> associating an options configuration with the first identifier, wherein the options configuration includes at least one configurable setting option related to the first communication service;
>
> ***detecting that a desktop component associated with the second communication account for the second communication service associated with the first identifier is being actively utilized, wherein the desktop component that is associated with the second***

> ***communication account is detected to be active when the desktop component is instantiated and in focus; and***
>
> ***upon detection of the desktop component, implementing the options configuration associated with the first identifier including the at least one configurable setting option related to the first communication service***.

(Emphasis added).

Independent claim 30 is allowable for at least the reason that *Mooney* fails to teach or suggest at least "detecting that a desktop component associated with the second communication account for the second communication service associated with the first identifier is being actively utilized, wherein the desktop component that is associated with the second communication account is detected to be active when the desktop component is instantiated and in focus; and upon detection of the desktop component, implementing the options configuration associated with the first identifier including the at least one configurable setting option related to the first communication service," as emphasized above.

For example, *Mooney* describes:

> For example, the message accounts can comprise a Microsoft Exchange email account provided on a Microsoft Exchange messaging server, a Lotus Notes email account provided on a Domino server and a Groupwise email account provided on a Groupwise server. These email accounts are arranged to be accessed using client application software specific to each type of email account and previously users have needed to install that application software on a user terminal. However, the present invention avoids this requirement by using a web server that provides a single web interface via which all the email accounts are accessible.
>
> The web server receives user inputs from a web browser on the user's terminal. These user inputs indicate for example that the user wishes to access email messages from one of the email accounts. The web server has access to pre-specified information about the messaging servers and about user names and passwords for the various email accounts. Also, the web server is able to communicate with all the different types of messaging server, for example, to retrieve email messages. Information from the messaging servers can then be displayed

> by the web server, using the single web interface. Thus by using a single web-interface the user is able to access all his or her message accounts and does not need to store application software for each account type on his or her terminal.
>
> The user only needs to learn how to use the single web-interface and does not need to continually adjust to different interfaces provided by the different message accounts.

Paragraphs 0012-0014. And, the Office Action construes web browser code in *Mooney* with the claimed service interface layer; construes a Cclient module with the claimed user agent; and construes web-based interface in *Mooney* with the claimed tray manager.

Mooney further describes:

> FIG. 7 shows an example of a user interface display presented to a user using the web based interface. The display contains a plurality of tabs 170 one for each message server that the user has pre-specified. By selecting a tab the user is automatically logged into the associated message server without an interactive dialog appearing. For example, in FIG. 7 the CallPilot tab has been selected and messages from the users CallPilot account are displayed. If the user selects the Exchange tab, then the user is automatically logged onto an Exchange server and messages from a pre-specified account on that server are displayed.
>
> . . .
>
> In the example shown in FIG. 7 the user is able to view and work with messages from only one particular message server at a time. However, this is not essential. It is also possible for messages from each of the message servers to be combined into a single "in-box" for access by the user.

Paragraphs 0105 and 0107. And, the Office Action construes a tab and the associated messaging account in *Mooney* as the claimed communication suite. *See* page 3. Claim 30 describes a scenario where a first communication account for a first communication service and a second communication account for a second communication service are associated with a first identifier. Further, claim 30 describes that the second communication service is detected to be actively utilized which causes option configuration(s) associated with the first communication account associated with the first communication service to be implemented.

Correspondingly, the Office Action references the CallPilot2 tab of Figure 7. However, use or selection of the CallPilot2 tab (e.g., one account) may cause a setting associated with the CallPilot2 tab or account to be implemented **but does not cause any settings associated with any of the tabs or accounts to take effect upon detection of another tab being in focus**.

As such, *Mooney* fails to teach or suggest at least "detecting that a desktop component associated with the second communication account for the second communication service associated with the first identifier is being actively utilized, wherein the desktop component that is associated with the second communication account is detected to be active when the desktop component is instantiated and in focus; and upon detection of the desktop component, implementing the options configuration associated with the first identifier including the at least one configurable setting option related to the first communication service," as recited in claim 30.

As a result, claim 30 is patentable over *Mooney*, and the rejection of claim 30 should be withdrawn. Since claims 31-33 depend from independent claim 30 and recite additional features, claims 31-33 are allowable over the cited art as a matter of law. Accordingly, the rejection of claims 31-33 should be withdrawn.

4. Response to Rejection of Claims under 35 U.S.C. §103

Claims 1, 3-7, 9, 14-16, 18-21, 23, and 25-29 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over *Mooney* in view of *Greef* (U.S. Patent No. 6,549,217). Claims 2, 8, and 24 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over *Mooney* in view of *Greef* further in view of *Agrawal* (U.S. Patent No. 6,592,627). Claim 22 has been rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over *Mooney* in view of *Greef* further in view of *Agrawal* further in view of *Chung* (U.S. Patent Pub. No. 2004/0117451). The rejections are traversed for at least the following reasons.

a. Claims 1 and 3-7

Independent claim 1 recites:

> A system for integrating communication services, comprising:
>
> a computer processor;
>
> a plurality of communication suites of communication services, each respective communication suite comprising:
>
> a plurality of communication accounts, each communication account associated with one of a plurality of communication services, the plurality of communication services comprising a first communication service; and
>
> a respective option configuration comprising at least one configurable option for each communication service associated within the respective communication suite, wherein each communication suite has a setting for each configurable option within the respective communication suite;
>
> a local service interface layer associated with each communication suite, wherein the local service interface layer instantiates a local user agent for each communication service of the communication suite; and
>
> ***a local tray manager that instantiates each of the local service interface layers and regulates a level of communications that occurs between a respective local service interface layer and local user agents associated with the local service interface layer, wherein the local tray manager detects when a desktop component that is associated with one of the plurality of communication suites is active and then directs the local service interface layer associated with the communication suite to assume an active status and directs a remainder of communication suites to assume an inactive status while still remaining instantiated, whereby the local user agents of inactive communication suites remain instantiated and notify associated communication services of the inactive states of the communication suites,***
>
> ***wherein the local service interface layer for an active communication suite is directed by the local tray manager to communicate directly to a local user interface and a local service interface layer for an inactive communication suite is directed by the local tray manager to suppress communications with the local user interface thereby causing the local user agents of the inactive communication suite to not receive and display message notifications for the inactive plurality of communication accounts associated with the inactive communication suite,***
>
> ***wherein the setting associated with each of the communication services associated with the active communication suite is implemented for the first communication service in lieu of***

> ***recognizing the setting associated with each of the communication services of the inactive communication suite,***
>
> ***wherein the desktop component that is associated with one of the plurality of communication suites is detected to be active when the desktop component is instantiated and in focus.***

(Emphasis added).

Independent claim 1 is allowable for at least the reason that *Mooney* in view of *Greef* fails to teach or suggest at least "a local tray manager that instantiates each of the local service interface layers and regulates a level of communications that occurs between a respective local service interface layer and local user agents associated with the local service interface layer, wherein the local tray manager detects when a desktop component that is associated with one of the plurality of communication suites is active and then directs the local service interface layer associated with the communication suite to assume an active status and directs a remainder of communication suites to assume an inactive status while still remaining instantiated, whereby the local user agents of inactive communication suites remain instantiated and notify associated communication services of the inactive states of the communication suites, wherein the local service interface layer for an active communication suite is directed by the local tray manager to communicate directly to a local user interface and a local service interface layer for an inactive communication suite is directed by the local tray manager to suppress communications with the local user interface thereby causing the local user agents of the inactive communication suite to not receive and display message notifications for the inactive plurality of communication accounts associated with the inactive communication suite, wherein the setting associated with each of the communication services associated with the active communication suite is implemented for the first communication service in lieu of recognizing the setting associated with each of the communication services of the inactive communication suite, wherein the desktop component that is associated with one of the plurality of communication suites is detected to be active when the desktop component is instantiated and in focus," as emphasized above.

For example, *Mooney* describes:

> For example, the message accounts can comprise a Microsoft Exchange email account provided on a Microsoft Exchange messaging server, a Lotus Notes email account provided on a Domino server and a Groupwise email account provided on a Groupwise server. These email accounts are arranged to be accessed using client application software specific to each type of email account and previously users have needed to install that application software on a user terminal. However, the present invention avoids this requirement by using a web server that provides a single web interface via which all the email accounts are accessible.
>
> The web server receives user inputs from a web browser on the user's terminal. These user inputs indicate for example that the user wishes to access email messages from one of the email accounts. The web server has access to pre-specified information about the messaging servers and about user names and passwords for the various email accounts. Also, the web server is able to communicate with all the different types of messaging server, for example, to retrieve email messages. Information from the messaging servers can then be displayed by the web server, using the single web interface. Thus by using a single web-interface the user is able to access all his or her message accounts and does not need to store application software for each account type on his or her terminal.
>
> The user only needs to learn how to use the single web-interface and does not need to continually adjust to different interfaces provided by the different message accounts.

Paragraphs 0012-0014. And, the Office Action construes web browser code in *Mooney* with the claimed service interface layer; construes a Cclient module with the claimed user agent; and construes web-based interface in *Mooney* with the claimed tray manager.

Mooney further describes:

> FIG. 7 shows an example of a user interface display presented to a user using the web based interface. The display contains a plurality of tabs 170 one for each message server that the user has pre-specified. By selecting a tab the user is automatically logged into the associated message server without an interactive dialog appearing. For example, in FIG. 7 the CallPilot tab has been selected and messages from the users CallPilot account are displayed. If the user selects the Exchange tab, then

> the user is automatically logged onto an Exchange server and messages from a pre-specified account on that server are displayed.

Paragraph 0105. And, the Office Action construes a tab and the associated messaging account in *Mooney* as the claimed communication suite. *See* page 3. In this construction, *Mooney* therefore does not disclose a plurality of communication suites of communication services, where each respective communication suite comprises a plurality of communication accounts, as described in claim 1.

For example, in one scenario, one may have two communication suites: a first communication suite comprising an instant messaging account for an instant messaging service and a first email account for an email service; and a second communication account comprising a second email account and a videoconferencing account for a videoconferencing service. In accordance with claim 1, the first communication suite comprises configurable option(s) for each of the instant messaging and email services (e.g., customized filter settings for instant messaging and customized message retrieval rates for email). Likewise, the second communication suite comprises also comprises configurable option(s) for each of the email and videoconferencing services (e.g., customized message retrieval rates for email that are different than above and customized alerts for the videoconferencing service). Thus, when a desktop component associated with the videoconferencing account is detected, the second communication suite becomes active and causes each of the configurable options and settings associated with each of the communication accounts of the second communication suite to be put into effect, since all of the communication accounts of the second communication are now active. These changes are made in lieu of implementing the configurable options and settings associated with each of the communication accounts of the first communication suite, since all of the communication accounts of the first communication suite are now inactive.

Similarly, the active second communication suite may receive notification on a user interface as to an email message arrival for the second email communication account, as an example, whereas notification for first email communication account of the inactive first communication account are not displayed on the same user interface.

In contrast, *Mooney* discloses a user interface comprising of a plurality of tabs, where each tab concerns a particular messaging service. Selection of one tab does not cause a plurality of settings associated with a plurality of communication accounts associated with a single communication suite to become active. Also, selection of one tab does not necessarily cause suppression of communications between an unselected tab and the user interface.

Further, *Greef* discloses a bookmark menu "wherein the bookmark menu provides for user selection of at least one bookmarked user profile, and arranging display elements on the display devices upon user selection of a user profile from the bookmark menu, wherein the display elements are arranged according to the indications in the selected user profile." Column 5, lines 4-9. Greef also states:

> For a further example, if "Bookmark B" contains indications that only application windows D and E are to be opened with indicated sizes, locations, and other top-level properties, then selection of "Bookmark B" will cause the following actions. First, application windows A, B and C will be closed, with optional warnings to save any unsaved information. Second, windows for applications D and E, with their indicated sizes, positions, and other top-level properties will be opened. Third, other properties present in the user profile, such as workspace properties including foreground and background colors, fonts, relative window layering, and so forth, will also be established.

Column 7, lines 50-62. It is noted that the Office Action considers the closing of an application to cause an inactive status. Page 7. However, the claim recites "to assume an inactive status while still remaining instantiated."

As such, *Mooney* in view of *Greef* fails to teach or suggest at least "a local tray manager that instantiates each of the local service interface layers and regulates a level of communications that occurs between a respective local service interface layer and local user agents associated with the local service interface layer, wherein the local tray manager detects when a desktop component that is associated with one of the plurality of communication suites is active and then directs the local service interface layer associated with the communication suite to assume an active status and directs a remainder of communication suites to assume an inactive status while still remaining instantiated, whereby the local user agents of inactive communication suites remain instantiated and notify associated communication services of the inactive states of the communication suites, wherein the local service interface layer for an active communication suite is directed by the local tray manager to communicate directly to a local user interface and a local service interface layer for an inactive communication suite is directed by the local tray manager to suppress communications with the local user interface thereby causing the local user agents of the inactive communication suite to not receive and display message notifications for the inactive plurality of communication accounts associated with the inactive communication suite, wherein the setting associated with each of the communication services associated with the active communication suite is implemented for the first communication service in lieu of recognizing the setting associated with each of the communication services of the inactive communication suite, wherein the desktop component that is associated with one of the plurality of communication suites is detected to be active when the desktop component is instantiated and in focus," as recited in claim 1.

As a result, claim 1 is patentable over *Mooney* in view of *Greef*, and the rejection of claim 1 should be withdrawn. Since claims 3-7 and 9 depend from independent claim 1 and recite additional features, claims 3-7 and 9 are allowable over the cited art as a matter of law. Accordingly, the rejection of claims 3-7 and 9 should be withdrawn.

b. Claims 14-16

Independent claim 14 recites:

> A system for integrating communication services, comprising:
>
> a computer processor;
>
> a tray manager associating a first communication account of a first communication service with a first identifier;
>
> the tray manager associating a second communication account of a second communication service with the first identifier, wherein a first communication suite comprises the first communication account and the second communication account;
>
> the tray manager associating a first options configuration with the

> first identifier, the first options configuration comprising at least one configurable option for the first communication service;
>
> the tray manager associating a third communication account of the first communication service with a second identifier, wherein a second communication suite comprises the third communication account;
>
> ***the tray manager detecting that a desktop component associated with one of the communication accounts associated with the first identifier is being actively utilized, wherein the desktop component that is associated with one of the communication accounts is detected to be active when the desktop component is instantiated and in focus; and***
>
> ***a user interface display displaying, upon the detection of the desktop component being actively utilized, in a large display area, information received from the first communication service via the first communication account according to the first options configuration and restricting, upon the detection of the desktop component being actively utilized, the display of information associated with the third communication account to a small display area***.

(Emphasis added).

Independent claim 14 is allowable for at least the reason that *Mooney* in view of *Greef* fails to teach or suggest at least "the tray manager detecting that a desktop component associated with one of the communication accounts associated with the first identifier is being actively utilized, wherein the desktop component that is associated with one of the communication accounts is detected to be active when the desktop component is instantiated and in focus; and a user interface display displaying, upon the detection of the desktop component being actively utilized, in a large display area, information received from the first communication service via the first communication account according to the first options configuration and restricting, upon the detection of the desktop component being actively utilized, the display of information associated with the third communication account to a small display area," as emphasized above.

For example, *Mooney* describes:

> For example, the message accounts can comprise a Microsoft Exchange email account provided on a Microsoft Exchange messaging server, a Lotus Notes email account provided on a Domino server and a Groupwise email account provided on a Groupwise server. These email

> accounts are arranged to be accessed using client application software specific to each type of email account and previously users have needed to install that application software on a user terminal. However, the present invention avoids this requirement by using a web server that provides a single web interface via which all the email accounts are accessible.
>
> The web server receives user inputs from a web browser on the user's terminal. These user inputs indicate for example that the user wishes to access email messages from one of the email accounts. The web server has access to pre-specified information about the messaging servers and about user names and passwords for the various email accounts. Also, the web server is able to communicate with all the different types of messaging server, for example, to retrieve email messages. Information from the messaging servers can then be displayed by the web server, using the single web interface. Thus by using a single web-interface the user is able to access all his or her message accounts and does not need to store application software for each account type on his or her terminal.
>
> The user only needs to learn how to use the single web-interface and does not need to continually adjust to different interfaces provided by the different message accounts.

Paragraphs 0012-0014. And, the Office Action construes web browser code in *Mooney* with the claimed service interface layer; construes a Cclient module with the claimed user agent; and construes web-based interface in *Mooney* with the claimed tray manager.

Mooney further describes:

> FIG. 7 shows an example of a user interface display presented to a user using the web based interface. The display contains a plurality of tabs 170 one for each message server that the user has pre-specified. By selecting a tab the user is automatically logged into the associated message server without an interactive dialog appearing. For example, in FIG. 7 the CallPilot tab has been selected and messages from the users CallPilot account are displayed. If the user selects the Exchange tab, then the user is automatically logged onto an Exchange server and messages from a pre-specified account on that server are displayed.
>
> . . .
>
> In the example shown in FIG. 7 the user is able to view and work with messages from only one particular message server at a time.

> However, this is not essential. It is also possible for messages from each of the message servers to be combined into a single "in-box" for access by the user.

Paragraphs 0105 and 0107. And, the Office Action construes a tab and the associated messaging account in *Mooney* as the claimed communication suite. *See* page 3. Claim 14 describes a scenario where a first communication account for a first communication service and a second communication account for a second communication service are associated with a first identifier. Further, claim 14 describes that the second communication service is detected to be actively utilized which causes option configuration(s) associated with the first communication account associated with the first communication service to be implemented.

Correspondingly, the Office Action references the CallPilot2 tab of Figure 7. However, use or selection of the CallPilot2 tab (e.g., one account) may cause a setting associated with the CallPilot2 tab or account to be implemented but does not cause any settings associated with any of the tabs or accounts to take effect.

Moreover, *Mooney* discloses a user interface comprising of a plurality of tabs, where each tab concerns a particular messaging service. Selection of one tab does not cause a plurality of settings associated with a plurality of communication accounts associated with a single communication suite to become active. Also, selection of one tab does not necessarily cause displaying of information received from the first communication service via the first communication account in a large display area of a user interface when active, while information received from the first communication account via the third communication account is displayed in a small display area while inactive.

Further, *Greef* discloses a bookmark menu “wherein the bookmark menu provides for user selection of at least one bookmarked user profile, and arranging display elements on the display devices upon user selection of a user profile from the bookmark menu, wherein the display elements are arranged according to the indications in the selected user profile.” Column 5, lines 4-9. *Greef* also states:

> For a further example, if "Bookmark B" contains indications that only application windows D and E are to be opened with indicated sizes, locations, and other top-level properties, then selection of "Bookmark B" will cause the following actions. First, application windows A, B and C will be closed, with optional warnings to save any unsaved information. Second, windows for applications D and E, with their indicated sizes, positions, and other top-level properties will be opened. Third, other properties present in the user profile, such as workspace properties including foreground and background colors, fonts, relative window layering, and so forth, will also be established.

Column 7, lines 50-62. It is noted that the Office Action considers the selection of a new user profile causing the system to close windows associated with the old profile to disclose the displaying of information associated with the third communication account to a small display area. Page 12. However, the claim recites that a desktop component is detected to being actively utilized by being in focus which causes the display of information not associated with the desktop component to be restricted to a small display area instead of a large display area.

As such, *Mooney* in view of *Greef* fails to teach or suggest at least “the tray manager detecting that a desktop component associated with one of the communication accounts associated with the first identifier is being actively utilized, wherein the desktop component that is associated with one of the communication accounts is detected to be active when the desktop component is instantiated and in focus; and a user interface display displaying, upon the detection of the desktop component being actively utilized, in a large display area, information received from the first communication service via the first communication account according to the first options configuration and restricting, upon the detection of the desktop component being actively utilized, the display of information associated with the third communication account to a small display area,” as recited in claim 14.

As a result, claim 14 is patentable over *Mooney* in view of *Greef*, and the rejection of claim 14 should be withdrawn. Since claims 15-16 depend from independent claim 14 and recite additional features, claims 15-16 are allowable over the cited art as a matter of law. Accordingly, the rejection of claims 15-16 should be withdrawn.

c. Claims 18-21, 23, and 25-29

Independent claim 18 recites:

> A method for integrating communication services, comprising:
>
> associating a first communication account of a first communication service with a first identifier;
>
> associating a second communication account of a second communication service with the first identifier, wherein a first communication suite comprises the first communication account and the second communication account;
>
> associating a first options configuration with the first identifier, the first options configuration comprising at least one configurable option for the first communication service;
>
> associating a third communication account of the first communication service with a second identifier, wherein a second communication suite comprises the third communication account;
>
> ***detecting that a desktop component associated with one of the communication accounts associated with the first identifier is being actively utilized, wherein the desktop component that is associated with one of the communication accounts is detected to be active when the desktop component is instantiated and in focus;***
>
> ***upon detection of the desktop component being actively utilized, displaying in a large display area, information received from the first communication service via the first communication account according to the first options configuration; and***
>
> ***upon detection of the desktop component being actively utilized, restricting the display of information associated with the third communication account to a small display area***.

(Emphasis added).

Independent claim 18 is allowable for at least the reason that *Mooney* in view of *Greef* fails to teach or suggest at least "detecting that a desktop component associated with one of the communication accounts associated with the first identifier is being actively utilized, wherein the desktop component that is associated with one of the communication accounts is detected to be active when the desktop component is instantiated and in focus; upon detection of the desktop component being actively utilized, displaying in a large display area, information received from the first communication service via the first communication account according to the first options configuration; and upon detection of the desktop component being actively utilized, restricting the display of information associated with the third communication account to a small display area," as emphasized above.

For example, *Mooney* describes:

> For example, the message accounts can comprise a Microsoft Exchange email account provided on a Microsoft Exchange messaging server, a Lotus Notes email account provided on a Domino server and a Groupwise email account provided on a Groupwise server. These email accounts are arranged to be accessed using client application software specific to each type of email account and previously users have needed to install that application software on a user terminal. However, the present invention avoids this requirement by using a web server that provides a single web interface via which all the email accounts are accessible.
>
> The web server receives user inputs from a web browser on the user's terminal. These user inputs indicate for example that the user wishes to access email messages from one of the email accounts. The web server has access to pre-specified information about the messaging servers and about user names and passwords for the various email accounts. Also, the web server is able to communicate with all the different types of messaging server, for example, to retrieve email messages. Information from the messaging servers can then be displayed by the web server, using the single web interface. Thus by using a single web-interface the user is able to access all his or her message accounts and does not need to store application software for each account type on his or her terminal.
>
> The user only needs to learn how to use the single web-interface and does not need to continually adjust to different interfaces provided by the different message accounts.

Paragraphs 0012-0014. And, the Office Action construes web browser code in *Mooney* with the claimed service interface layer; construes a Cclient module with the claimed user agent; and construes web-based interface in *Mooney* with the claimed tray manager.

Mooney further describes:

> FIG. 7 shows an example of a user interface display presented to a user using the web based interface. The display contains a plurality of tabs 170 one for each message server that the user has pre-specified. By selecting a tab the user is automatically logged into the associated

> message server without an interactive dialog appearing. For example, in FIG. 7 the CallPilot tab has been selected and messages from the users CallPilot account are displayed. If the user selects the Exchange tab, then the user is automatically logged onto an Exchange server and messages from a pre-specified account on that server are displayed.
>
> . . .
>
> In the example shown in FIG. 7 the user is able to view and work with messages from only one particular message server at a time. However, this is not essential. It is also possible for messages from each of the message servers to be combined into a single "in-box" for access by the user.

Paragraphs 0105 and 0107. And, the Office Action construes a tab and the associated messaging account in *Mooney* as the claimed communication suite. *See* page 3. Claim 18 describes a scenario where a first communication account for a first communication service and a second communication account for a second communication service are associated with a first identifier. Further, claim 18 describes that the second communication service is detected to be actively utilized which causes option configuration(s) associated with the first communication account associated with the first communication service to be implemented.

Correspondingly, the Office Action references the CallPilot2 tab of Figure 7. However, use or selection of the CallPilot2 tab (e.g., one account) may cause a setting associated with the CallPilot2 tab or account to be implemented but does not cause any settings associated with any of the tabs or accounts to take effect.

Moreover, *Mooney* discloses a user interface comprising of a plurality of tabs, where each tab concerns a particular messaging service. Selection of one tab does not cause a plurality of settings associated with a plurality of communication accounts associated with a single communication suite to become active. Also, selection of one tab does not necessarily cause displaying of information received from the first communication service via the first communication account in a large display area of a user interface when active, while information received from the first communication account via the third communication account is displayed in a small display area while inactive.

Further, *Greef* discloses a bookmark menu "wherein the bookmark menu provides for user selection of at least one bookmarked user profile, and arranging display elements on the display devices upon user selection of a user profile from the bookmark menu, wherein the display elements are arranged according to the indications in the selected user profile." Column 5, lines 4-9. *Greef* also states:

> For a further example, if "Bookmark B" contains indications that only application windows D and E are to be opened with indicated sizes, locations, and other top-level properties, then selection of "Bookmark B" will cause the following actions. First, application windows A, B and C will be closed, with optional warnings to save any unsaved information. Second, windows for applications D and E, with their indicated sizes, positions, and other top-level properties will be opened. Third, other properties present in the user profile, such as workspace properties including foreground and background colors, fonts, relative window layering, and so forth, will also be established.

Column 7, lines 50-62. It is noted that the Office Action considers the selection of a new user profile causing the system to close windows associated with the old profile to disclose the displaying of information associated with the third communication account to a small display area. Page 12. However, the claim recites that a desktop component is detected to being actively utilized by being in focus which causes the display of information not associated with the desktop component to be restricted to a small display area instead of a large display area.

As such, *Mooney* in view of *Greef* fails to teach or suggest at least "detecting that a desktop component associated with one of the communication accounts associated with the first identifier is being actively utilized, wherein the desktop component that is associated with one of the communication accounts is detected to be active when the desktop component is instantiated and in focus; upon detection of the desktop component being actively utilized, displaying in a large display area, information received from the first communication service via the first communication account according to the first options configuration; and upon detection of the desktop component being actively utilized, restricting the display of information associated with the third communication account to a small display area," as recited in claim 18.

As a result, claim 18 is patentable over *Mooney* in view of *Greef*, and the rejection of claim 18 should be withdrawn. Since claims 19-21, 23, and 25-29 depend from independent claim 18 and recite additional features, claims 19-21, 23, and 25-29 are allowable over the cited art as a matter of law. Accordingly, the rejection should be withdrawn.

d. Claims 2, 8, and 24

All of the claimed features of independent claims 1 and 18 are not taught and suggested by *Mooney* and *Greef*, as previously discussed. Further, *Agrawal* does not remedy the deficiencies of the cited art with respect to independent claims 1 and 18. Since claims 2, 8, and 24 depend from respective independent claims 1 and 18 and recite additional features, claims 2, 8, and 24 are allowable over the cited art as a matter of law. Accordingly, the rejection should be withdrawn.

e. Claim 22

All of the claimed features of independent claim 18 are not taught and suggested by *Mooney* and G*reef*, as previously discussed. Further, *Agrawal* and *Chung* do not remedy the deficiencies of the cited art with respect to independent claim 18. Since claim 22 depends from independent claim 18 and recites additional features, claim 22 is allowable over the cited art as a matter of law. Accordingly, the rejection should be withdrawn.

f. Claim 28

All of the claimed features of independent claim 18 is not taught and suggested by *Mooney* and *Greef*, as previously discussed. Further, *Musil* and *Agrawal* do not remedy the deficiencies of the cited art with respect to independent claim 18. Since claim 28 and depends from independent claim 18 respectively and recites additional features, claim 28 is allowable over the cited art as a matter of law. Accordingly, the rejection should be withdrawn.

CONCLUSION

Any other statements in the Office Action that are not explicitly addressed herein are not intended to be admitted. In addition, any and all findings of inherency are traversed as not having been shown to be necessarily present. Furthermore, any and all findings of well-known art and official notice, or statements interpreted similarly, should not be considered well known for at least the specific and particular reason that the Office Action does not include specific factual findings predicated on sound technical and scientific reasoning to support such conclusions.

For at least the reasons set forth above, Assignee respectfully submits that all objections and/or rejections have been traversed, rendered moot, and/or accommodated, and that the pending claims are in condition for allowance. Favorable reconsideration and allowance of the present application and all pending claims are hereby courteously requested. In addition, Assignee reserves the right to address any comments made in the Office Action that were not specifically addressed herein. Thus, such comments should not be deemed admitted by the Assignee. If, in the opinion of the Examiner, a telephonic conference would expedite the examination of this matter, the Examiner is invited to call the undersigned agent at (770) 933-9500.

Respectfully submitted,

/Charles W. Griggers/
Charles W. Griggers
Reg. No. 47,283

AT&T Legal Department – TKHR
Attn: Patent Docketing
One AT&T Way
Room 2A-207
Bedminster, NJ 07921
Customer No.: **38823**